

Remarks/Arguments:

Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Claims 1-14 are pending.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the resin portions are discolored below a surface of the resin optical component. No new matter is introduced herein. Basis for the amendment can be found, for example, at paragraph [0011]; paragraph [0013]; paragraph [0018]; paragraphs [0029-0034]; and Figs. 1B and 3B.

Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mitsubishi (JP 2000-292861). It is respectfully submitted that this ground for rejection is overcome for the reasons set forth below.

With respect to claim 1, Mitsubishi does not disclose or suggest:

...resin portions which are discolored by energy in an absorption wavelength band of the resin...

...the resin optical component includes a body and at least one lens surface, the resin portions being discolored in the body of the resin optical component without affecting the lens surface...,

as required by claim 1.

Mitsubishi discloses, in Fig. 1, sets of lenticular lenses 1, 2 formed on opposite surfaces of a light transmissive substrate 5. Black stripes 3 that act as a light absorbing layer are formed in recesses between lenticular lenses 1. Lenticular lenses 1, 2 and stripes 3 are each formed using active energy line-cured resin. (Abstract). At paragraph [0020] (of a machine translation), Mitsubishi teaches that a light diffusion agent is included in the resin that forms black stripes 3 and that energy is applied to harden the resin forming black stripes 3.

Mitsubishi, however, does not disclose or suggest that the resin portions are discolored in the body of the resin optical component without affecting the lens surface, as required by claim 1. Mitsubishi teaches, instead, that black stripes 3 are formed in recesses between lenticular lenses 1. In other words, stripes 3 are formed on surfaces of lenticular lenses 1 such that stripes 3 do affect the lens surface. In addition, Mitsubishi does not disclose or suggest that resin portions are discolored by energy, as required by claim 1. Mitsubishi, instead, includes a light diffusion agent (i.e., to discolor stripes 3) in the resin that forms black

stripes 3 and applies energy to harden the resin (paragraph [0020]). Mitsubishi is silent on discoloring resin portions by energy. Thus, Mitsubishi does not include all of the features of claim 1.

Because Mitsubishi does not include all of the limitations of claim 1, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U. S. C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mitsubishi and claims 2-4 and 6, which depend from claim 1, are also not subject to rejection under 35 U. S. C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mitsubishi for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

With respect to claim 7, this ground for rejection is respectfully traversed. In particular, claim 7 includes a feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Mitsubishi, namely:

...forming a high light absorptance portion by discoloring a portion of the resin by the supplied energy.

Mitsubishi is described above. Mitsubishi does not teach forming a high light absorptance portion by discoloring a portion of the resin by supplied energy, as required by claim 7. Black stripes 3, instead, are discolored due to the inclusion of a light diffusion agent. The supplied energy is only used to harden the resin. (Paragraph [0020] of the machine translation). Mitsubishi is silent on discoloring a portion of the resin by supplied energy. Thus, Mitsubishi does not include all of the features of claim 7.

Because Mitsubishi does not include all of the limitations of claim 7, claim 7 is not subject to rejection under 35 U. S. C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mitsubishi and claims 8-12 and 14, which depend from claim 7, are also not subject to rejection under 35 U. S. C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mitsubishi for at least the same reasons as claim 7.

Applicants appreciate the indication that claim 5 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5 and 13 have not been amended into independent form, however, because it is submitted that respective claims 1 and 7, from which claims 5 and 13 depend, are allowable for the reasons set forth above.

Appln. No.: 10/561,350
Amendment Dated December 23, 2008
Reply to Office Action of September 26, 2008

NSG-256US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14 and the objection to claims 5 and 13.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Deborah M. Grove, Reg. No 61,091
Attorney/Patent Agent for Applicants

KNN/DMG/pb

Dated: December 23, 2008

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

P_H:\NRPORTBL\RP\PCBOCELLA\373803_1.DOC